

**MINUTES OF REGULAR MEETING
OF
GREENSBORO PLANNING BOARD
JANUARY 19, 2005**

The Greensboro Planning Board met in regular session on Wednesday, January 19, 2005 at 2:00 p.m., in the City Council Chambers, 2nd floor, Melvin Municipal Office Building. Board members present were Chair Patrick Downs, Dick Hall, Alan Pike, Stephen Marks, John Rhodes, Julius Koonce, Tim Bryson and Michael Fox. Planning staff members present were Dick Hails, Planning Director, Bill Ruska, Alec MacIntosh, Heidi Galanti and Ricky Hurley.

Chair Downs called the January meeting into session.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF THE DECEMBER 15, 2004 REGULAR MEETING.

Mr. Rhodes moved approval of the minutes of the December 15, 2004 regular meeting as submitted, seconded by Mr. Bryson. The Board voted 8-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Downs, Hall, Pike, Marks, Bryson, Rhodes, Koonce, Fox. Nays: None.)

Chair Downs rearranged the agenda so that items with persons present to speak were heard first.

PUBLIC HEARINGS:

Ms. Galanti gave a few opening remarks on the Comp Plan amendments. This is the Board's first chance to look at staff initiated Comp Plan amendments. The need for these amendments came to the attention of staff primarily from working with customers, particularly at the time of rezoning. Staff is keeping a list of areas that are identified and we plan to bring them forward approximately twice a year for consideration. These amendments were presented to the Comprehensive Plan Monitoring Committee for their information and feedback. Their comments were utilized to refine the amendments that staff brings before the Board. The GFLUM is intended to be used as a guide in conjunction with the other goals and policies of the Plan. Staff is bringing forward areas that do not appear to meet the goals and objectives of the Plan. Every five years, the Plan is to undergo a complete update.

Staff mailed out packets to the Board Members ahead of the meeting that contained maps and staff reports for the proposed amendments. Included in each report was a staff analysis based on the required criteria of: the need for the change, the effect of the change on the City's services and facilities, implications, if any, that the amendment would have on other parts of the Plan, and unforeseen circumstances or the emergence of new information. The report also included conformity with other plans, applicable goals and policies from the Plan, other staff comments and staff's recommendation.

C. ORDINANCE AMENDING THE GENERALIZED FUTURE LAND USE MAP (FIGURE 4-2) OF THE GREENSBORO CONNECTIONS 2025 COMPREHENSIVE PLAN FOR PROPERTIES IN THE VICINITY OF THE SOUTH SIDE OF WEST FRIENDLY AVENUE BETWEEN DOLLEY MADISON ROAD AND MUIRS CHAPEL ROAD. THE AMENDMENTS ARE BROKEN DOWN INTO THE FOLLOWING FOUR AREAS: AREA A IS PROPOSED TO BE AMENDED FROM THE LOW RESIDENTIAL LAND USE CLASSIFICATION TO THE MIXED USE COMMERCIAL LAND USE CLASSIFICATION; AREA B IS PROPOSED TO BE AMENDED FROM THE LOW RESIDENTIAL LAND USE CLASSIFICATION TO THE HIGH RESIDENTIAL LAND USE CLASSIFICATION; AREA C IS PROPOSED TO BE

AMENDED FROM THE HIGH RESIDENTIAL AND MIXED USE COMMERCIAL LAND USE CLASSIFICATIONS TO THE LOW RESIDENTIAL LAND USE CLASSIFICATION; AND AREA D IS PROPOSED TO BE AMENDED FROM THE LOW RESIDENTIAL LAND USE CLASSIFICATION TO THE HIGH RESIDENTIAL LAND USE CLASSIFICATION. (RECOMMENDED)

Ms. Galanti referred to the map and reviewed Areas A, B, C and D in this proposed amendment. She also reviewed the existing land uses to be as follows:

- Area A: Offices, restaurants, gas station
- Area B: Apartments (note that approximately 4 acres at the end of Arrowhead Drive have been dedicated to the City as permanent open space)
- Area C: Single-family
- Area D: Apartments

Amendments to Areas A, B, D were supported by staff primarily due to:

- location within a designated Activity Center – which are concentrations of uses that function as destinations or hubs of activity for the surrounding area with a mix of higher intensity uses, compact development pattern and pedestrian and transit linkages;
- provision of services and employment opportunities to the surrounding neighborhoods;
- more opportunities for reinvestment;
- proximity to Guilford College campus; and
- adjacent to major roads.

Amendments to Area C were supported by staff primarily due to:

- The protection of an existing stable single-family neighborhood.

The Planning Department recommends approval of changing the land use classification for Areas A-D as follows:

- Area A from **Low Residential** to **Mixed Use Commercial**
- Area B from **Low Residential** to **High Residential**
- Area C from **High Residential and Mixed use Commercial** to **Low Residential**; and
- Area D from **Low Residential** to **High Residential**.

Ms. Galanti said the adjacent property owners were notified by a very similar notification process to the rezoning cases. They notified properties within the area and within 600 feet of the area proposed for change.

In response to a question from Mr. Rhodes, Mr. Hails said in simpler language staff was trying to make the GFLUM reflect the current land uses out in this area in the vast majority of cases.

Ms. Galanti said staff was trying to recognize the land uses there and what could be promoted for the future. Considering that it is in an Activity Center, they are trying to promote the intensity and density of uses in Areas A, B and D. In Area C, they are recognizing that it is a stable, single-family detached neighborhood that they do not see changing over time. They would like to recognize it and promote its stability. It does not appear to be an area in transition or soon to be in transition. She said she was not a real estate analyst, but this is a GFLUM classification and not a rezoning designation. So she cannot answer specifically what it would do to property values, but she did not feel this would have any major impact on the property values.

Mr. Hails reminded the Board that the public right to zone and the public right to plan oftentimes has real estate outcomes at the back end, but the considerations used in trying to judge compatibility of

uses, sufficient space for different uses, etc., actual changing of property values as a result of those recommendations is usually not a consideration for the recommendation or the decision.

Chair Downs opened the public hearing.

Andy Nelson, 901 Coronado, said it appeared that the property in this land use change was being changed to exactly what it is now.

Mr. Hails said that there is a possibility that a few scattered uses that had not come to their attention, but certainly in 95 percent of the cases that was staff's intent.

Michael Morris, 603 Leawood Drive, said he would like to know if this amendment was prompted by a developer or if it was just what staff thought the proper land use is.

Mr. Hails said it was primarily brought to staff's attention that the current land uses were not conforming with the adopted Plan and staff wanted to get the adopted Plan Map more accurate to reflect the existing land uses. There is no planned development activity related to this area, to staff's knowledge.

No other persons wished to speak to this item and Chair Downs closed the public hearing.

Mr. Marks moved that the Board recommend the ordinance to City Council. Mr. Rhodes seconded the motion. The Board voted 8-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Downs, Hall, Pike, Bryson, Koonce, Rhodes, Marks, Fox. Nays: None.)

In response to a question from Mr. Hails, Chair Downs said the staff recommendation could be given during the presentation.

D. ORDINANCE AMENDING THE GENERALIZED FUTURE LAND USE MAP (FIGURE 4-2) OF THE GREENSBORO CONNECTIONS 2025 COMPREHENSIVE PLAN FOR PROPERTIES IN THE VICINITY OF THE INTERSECTION OF WEST MARKET STREET AND DOLLEY MADISON ROAD/MEADOWOOD STREET FROM THE LOW AND HIGH RESIDENTIAL LAND USE CLASSIFICATIONS TO THE MIXED USE COMMERCIAL LAND USE CLASSIFICATION. (RECOMMENDED)

Ms. Galanti identified the area included in this proposed amendment. She also reviewed the existing land uses to be as follows: Office/Warehouse/Retail /Service.

Staff supported the amendment primarily due to:

- It supports a mix of uses at higher density and intensity;
- provision of services to the surrounding neighborhoods;
- the current character of the area;
- more opportunities for future reinvestment;
- adjacent to major roads;
- location near a proposed commuter rail and station (proposed at the intersection of the tracks and Guilford College Road);and

- supports a reduction of auto trips.

The Planning Department recommends approval of changing the land use classifications from Low and High Residential to Mixed Use Commercial for the proposed area.

Chair Downs opened the public hearing.

Ralph Deatherage, 5721 Friendswood Drive, said he was recently before the Zoning Commission to oppose the rezoning of some of the land between Friendswood Drive and Hackney Road near Guilford College Road. He saw it as a threat to the neighborhood of Friendswood. The Commission agreed with him and turned down the rezoning request. In looking at this map, he had that same problem. Apparently this amendment is to get all of the mini storage under one classification for this map. He said the Friendswood neighborhood was a very developed community that is mature, single family with very large lots. In the 39 years he had lived there, the entire area has been surrounded by commercial development of one kind or another. He had no problem with anything north of Hackney Road, but he did have a problem with where it crosses for such a small part. He thinks it will be an Achilles heel for their neighborhood.

Ms. Galanti pointed out on the map the properties to which Mr. Deatherage was referring, the Auto Zone and mini storage, so staff was bringing down the designation to recognize those land uses that currently existed. This area (pointing to the Hackney Road area) is residential, but it is in transition. Staff had a couple of calls from the folks on Hackney Road, wondering if their land use classification could change and they were not necessarily against that. Staff did not include the Hackney Road area, but this area can be seen as a transitional area. This neighborhood where Mr. Deatherage lives is definitely a stable, single family area.

Mr. Fox said it appeared to him that staff is not really putting a designation south of Hackney Road that wasn't there previously. Staff is just amending it to be on a lot line as opposed to expanding it beyond what it already is.

Ms. Galanti stated confirmed that was correct.

Mr. Deatherage said that really did not alleviate his concerns. The fuzzy line also cuts through the area of some houses that are single family zoned. The mini storage was there when the property was brought into the City, so it was grandfathered. This classification is just recognizing that they are there, but it was also opening the door for somebody else to tear those things down and put up something else. That "something else" was what bothered him. The Hackney Road community has been there a long time. He understands there is a plan to cut that road through to Meadowood, especially if the shopping center is developed on the property across the street from it. He thinks that particular corner lot is going to be the key that will make that entire area on Hackney Road start deteriorating. When that happens, it will flow to the houses that back up to it and to the houses that are facing them. Now we are talking about his neighborhood. He thinks it is important to recognize that corner (Hackney Road and Guilford College Road) and not encourage anybody to build something else other than what is already there. This type of designation seems to be encouraging the heavy commercial development that he does not want to see infringe upon the neighborhood. The request has already been made through zoning to start knocking down some of these houses, which will create a domino effect.

There was a very long discussion consisting of questions from Board members, which were answered by staff. Some of the questions concerned this particular proposed amendment. Some of

the questions were to clarify the Board's role and what its members should be looking for in these instances. Staff did point out that the zoning on the lots at the corner of Hackney Road and Guilford College were currently zoned CD-HB (Highway Business) and LI (Light Industrial).

There was no one else who wished to speak. Chair Downs closed the public hearing.

The discussion between Board members and staff continued, with staff answering some site-specific questions and some general questions posed by the Board members.

Mr. Rhodes moved recommendation of the ordinance in its current configuration. This motion was seconded by Mr. Pike. The Board voted 6-2 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Hall, Pike, Rhodes, Koonce, Marks, Fox. Nays: Downs, Bryson.)

E. ORDINANCE AMENDING THE GENERALIZED FUTURE LAND USE MAP (FIGURE 4-2) OF THE GREENSBORO CONNECTIONS 2025 COMPREHENSIVE PLAN FOR PROPERTIES ON THE WEST SIDE OF PENRY ROAD NEAR EAST WENDOVER AVENUE FROM THE LOW RESIDENTIAL LAND USE CLASSIFICATION TO THE INSTITUTIONAL LAND USE CLASSIFICATION. (RECOMMENDED)

Ms. Galanti pointed out the subject property on the map. She said the existing land uses for this area are currently undeveloped and single family.

Staff supports the amendment primarily due to:

- the recent purchase of the land by GTCC
- it supports a future expansion of the new GTCC campus that is located immediately south of this area,
- promotes economic opportunities for employment and services on the East side of the City.
- promotes growth in this area,
- supports the designation as a potential Activity Center which are concentrations of uses that function as destinations or hubs of activity for the surrounding area with a mix of higher intensity uses, compact development pattern and pedestrian and transit linkages;
- location close to a proposed commuter rail and a station (currently proposed east of the Urban Loop at the intersection of the tracks and Burlington Road).

The Planning Department recommends approval of change in the land use classification from Low Residential to Institutional for the proposed area.

Mr. Marks said he and a partner own property across the street from the subject property.

Mr. Fox moved that Mr. Marks be excused from consideration or voting on this proposed amendment. Mr. Hall seconded the motion. The Board voted 7-0-1 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Downs, Hall, Pike, Rhodes, Koonce, Bryson, Fox. Nays: None. Abstain: Marks.)

Chair Downs opened the public hearing.

Richard Bowden, 4430 Anderson Road, said his property was connected to the subject property. He

said it looked as though part of his land was included in the proposed amendment. Land east and west of his property was sold to GTCC, but his was not.

Mr. Hails said staff did not have that information and staff incorrectly prepared the map as a result. Their intent was only to modify the land use for the property owned by GTCC. Staff would not have a problem with considering a reduction in this area in the request. Since they had notified on the larger area that reduction would be in order.

Mr. Bowden asked what affect this land use change will have on his property, going from Low Residential to Institutional.

Ms. Galanti added that this was not a rezoning. It is a land use classification. All of this area has already been zoned to Public & Institutional for GTCC, minus the piece just talked about. Mr. Bowden's property had not been rezoned to PI. The glitch was that the GFLUM did not accurately reflect the GTCC rezoning case, which did not include Mr. Bowden's property.

Mr. Hall left the meeting at 3:49 p.m.

There were no other persons wishing to speak. Chair Downs closed the public hearing.

Mr. Pike moved recommendation, with the stipulation that the property affected will conform with the zoned property owned by GTCC. Mr. Koonce seconded the motion. The Board voted 7-0-1 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Downs, Hall, Pike, Rhodes, Bryson, Koonce, Fox. Nays: None. Abstain: Marks.)

H. RESOLUTION CLOSING AN UNNAMED 15-FOOT ALLEY, LOCATED 100 FEET EAST OF MARTIN LUTHER KING, JR. DRIVE AND RUNNING FROM DALE STREET NORTHWESTWARD TO ITS END, A DISTANCE OF APPROXIMATELY 103 FEET. (RECOMMENDED)

Mr. MacIntosh said this alley right-of-way was dedicated by the Mr. and Mrs. R. F. Rice Subdivision (Plat Book 6, Page 129) in 1925. The alley is not open all the way through, but the driveway for the house at 709 Dale Street may be located in a portion of the alley. Also, it appears that an accessory building at that address may slightly encroach into the alley. If the alley is closed, any encroachment should be remedied, because the presumption in N.C. is that half of a closed alley goes to the abutting owner on each side. The closing petition has been signed by the owners of 100% of the abutting property. The Technical Review Committee (TRC) recommends the closing.

Chair Downs opened the public hearing.

Zack Browning, 1229 Martin Luther King, Jr. Drive, a petitioner, spoke in support.

There were no other speakers on the alley closing. Chair Downs closed the public hearing.

Mr. Pike moved recommendation of the resolution closing the alley. Mr. Bryson seconded the motion. The Board voted 8-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Downs, McIntyre, Rhodes, Bryson, Koonce, Marks, Fox. Nays: None.)

A. ORDINANCE AMENDING THE GENERALIZED FUTURE LAND USE MAP (FIGURE 4-2) OF THE GREENSBORO CONNECTIONS 2025 COMPREHENSIVE PLAN FOR PROPERTIES IN THE VICINITY OF THE NORTHWEST CORNER OF THE INTERSECTION OF COLISEUM BOULEVARD STRETCHING FROM COLISEUM BOULEVARD TO WILLOMORE STREET FROM THE LOW RESIDENTIAL LAND USE CLASSIFICATION TO THE MIXED USE COMMERCIAL LAND USE CLASSIFICATION. (RECOMMENDED)

Ms. Galanti identified the property contained in this proposed amendment, and reviewed the existing land uses on the properties to be as follows: Gateway Business Center, NC Dept. of Motor Vehicles, and an undeveloped parcel on Coliseum Blvd. This request is immediately adjacent to a recent citizen initiated Plan amendment to Mixed Use Commercial on Lovett Street to provide a mixed use office/retail building.

Staff supports the amendment primarily due to:

- The provision of a mixed use center for the surrounding neighborhood
- Provision of services and employment opportunities within walkable distance to the surrounding neighborhoods
- Located adjacent to two major roads (Coliseum Blvd and Freeman Mill Road)
- Located near a proposed Bus Rapid Transit station (proposed at the intersection of Freeman Mill and Coliseum Boulevard)
- Provision of these uses in the vicinity of the surrounding neighborhoods may reduce auto trips

The Planning Department recommends approval of changing the land use classification from Low Residential to Mixed Use Commercial for the area proposed.

No one was present who wished to speak to this proposed amendment and Chair Downs closed the public hearing.

Ms. Galanti said staff looked at the neighborhood across Freeman Mill Road and there is a gas station and a fruit stand business. Staff also looked at the general density of the residential area in that neighborhood. When they looked at the overall density, it still fell in the Low Residential category. They determined that leaving the Low Residential Land Use Classification was most appropriate.

In response to a question from Mr. Rhodes, Mr. Hails said the previous Plan amendment on Lovett Street and the rezoning subsequently went on to City Council. The Council representative from this district expressed concerns and Jim Westmoreland, Director of GDOT, indicated to Council that they planned a study of concerns about cut-through traffic going up Lovett to Aycock and its impact on

the single-family neighborhood. So he thought that agreement to do a study was as a direct result of some of the comments made on both the Plan amendment and the rezoning.

Mr. Bryson moved a recommendation of the proposed amendment to the GFLUM. Mr. Marks seconded the motion. The Board voted 8-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Downs, Hall, Pike, Rhodes,

Marks, Koonce, Bryson, Fox. Nays: None.)

B. ORDINANCE AMENDING THE GENERALIZED FUTURE LAND USE MAP (FIGURE 4-2) OF THE GREENSBORO CONNECTIONS 2025 COMPREHENSIVE PLAN FOR PROPERTIES ROUGHLY BOUNDED BY EAST WASHINGTON STREET TO THE SOUTH, SOUTH DUDLEY STREET TO THE WEST, THE RAILROAD TRACKS TO THE NORTH, AND GANT STREET TO THE EAST FROM THE LOW RESIDENTIAL LAND USE CLASSIFICATION TO THE MIXED USE RESIDENTIAL LAND USE CLASSIFICATION. (RECOMMENDED)

Ms. Galanti identified on the map the properties involved in the subject proposed amendment. She reviewed the existing land uses on the properties to be as follows: generally a mix of apartments, single family homes, duplexes, industrial, churches, community center and offices.

The area includes portions of the Eastside Park Redevelopment Plan, the East Market Street Corridor Plan and is adjacent to Willow Oaks, this amendment is supported by these plans..

Staff supports the amendment primarily due to:

- A mix of uses and residential types support the long-term sustainability of neighborhoods
- Provides services and employment opportunities within the neighborhood
- Opens up more opportunities for further reinvestment
- Located near a proposed Bus Rapid Transit station (proposed at US29 and E. Lee Street)
- Located near a proposed commuter rail station (proposed at the intersection of the tracks and US29 near East Market Street)
- Provision of these uses in the neighborhood may reduce auto trips

The Planning Department recommends approval of changing the land use classification from Low Residential to Mixed Use Residential for the proposed area shown on the screen.

No one was present who wished to speak to this proposed amendment and Chair Downs closed the public hearing.

In response to a question from the Board, Ms. Galanti said the residential density could increase. Right now there are apartments, duplexes and single-family there, so it likely does not meet the low-density residential criteria currently. It could be supportive of additional multifamily units in the area as well. Staff feels the Mixed Use-Residential conforms to the on-ground density and the sustainability of that neighborhood in providing different housing types and uses.

Mr. Rhodes moved to recommend the proposed amendment to the GFLUM. Mr. Koonce seconded the motion. The Board voted 8-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Downs, Hall, Pike, Koonce, Marks, Bryson, Rhodes, Fox. Nays: None.)

E. ORDINANCE AMENDING CHAPTER 4, LAND USE, OF THE GREENSBORO CONNECTIONS 2025 COMPREHENSIVE PLAN, AS FOLLOWS: 1) ADD A STATEMENT TO SECTION 4.3, GENERALIZED FUTURE LAND USE, TO INCORPORATE SMALL AREA PLANS, CORRIDOR PLANS, ETC. INTO THE COMPREHENSIVE PLAN AS THEY ARE ADOPTED; 2) AMEND FOUR LAND USE CLASSIFICATION DEFINITIONS; AND 3)

ADD A CLARIFICATION STATEMENT TO THE GENERALIZED FUTURE LAND USE MAP (FIGURE 4-2). (RECOMMENDED)

Ms. Galanti said they had now switched from map amendments to text amendments. She presented slides that contained the proposed text amendments separately and explained them fully.

Incorporation of Plans

Add the following statement to the end of the first paragraph in Section 4.3, “As Connections 2025 is implemented, small area plans, neighborhood plans, corridor plans, etc. will be developed. These plans will be created at an depict a greater level of detail than the Generalized Future Land Use map (Figure 4-2). Therefore, any such plans adopted subsequent to adoption of Connections 2025 are incorporated into the Plan and referenced on Figure 4-2. All such plans shall be considered when making land development decisions. Greater emphasis should be placed on detailed policies, plans, studies and other documents over those setting forth generalized comprehensive planning objectives.”

The Plan does call for the development of Corridor and Area Plans, Lindley Park being the most recent one that has been adopted. Staff wanted to clarify that this Plan should be used in making decisions in this area. Rather than looking at the GFLUM, staff wanted to refer people to the adopted Lindley Park Area Plan to look at the goals and policies and the land use map that is provided as a part of that Plan. She presented an example of what would be seen on the GFLUM for all such plans that are adopted by City Council.

Ms. Galanti said those plans that are adopted include more specific land use maps and policies. Staff is saying, go to the adopted document for the smaller area and refer to the more detailed Plan before making development decisions, rather than looking at the general policies set forth in the Comp Plan as a whole. She said those area plans are very parcel specific in their land use recommendations. When these plans are adopted, they are incorporated into the Comp Plan by reference. So it says anything shown on that map is an adopted plan, and it is then a part of the Comp Plan. The Lindley Park Plan came before this Board and the Board made a favorable recommendation to Council.

Four Definition Amendments to Section 4.3

1. Amend the **Moderate Residential** density range to read “over 5 to 12 dwelling units.”

Ms. Galanti stated that there is currently a density gap between 5 and 6 dwelling units per acre between the Low Residential (currently 3-5 du/acre) and the Moderate Residential (currently 6-12 du/acre) land use classifications. By modifying the Moderate Residential land use classification density to read “over 5 to 12 dwelling units per acre”, the gap and any confusion associated with it is eliminated. This means that developments with 5 dwelling units per acre or less would be

considered Low Residential and developments with over 5 dwelling units to the acre would be considered Moderate Residential.

Mr. Hails said the Moderate Residential category is intended to accommodate small lot, single-family up to apartments, whereas if you are really concerned about small lots not being appropriate in certain locations, Low Density residential was probably the preferred classification.

2. Amend the **High Residential** definition to add the following as the last sentence: “Within this district, office buildings may also be accommodated.”

Ms. Galanti stated that currently the definition for the High Residential land use classification does not accommodate office buildings. Policies of the Plan such as reducing auto trips and promoting walkability support placing employment close to housing. When considering these policies, office buildings and multi-family developments can be compatible uses and they can be accommodated within the same land use classification. It is important to note the wording which says that “... office buildings may also be accommodated”. Compatibility will still need to be assessed through the setting, scale, massing, and design to determine whether or not the uses will ultimately be compatible.

3. Amend the **Mixed Use Commercial** definition to add the following as the last sentence: “New “strip” commercial development is discouraged.”

Ms. Galanti stated that one of the goals of the Plan is to improve the quality of development. Within the definition there is encouragement to diversify the mix of uses in older highway corridors over time that are characterized with “strip” commercial uses. Staff felt that it was necessary to clarify that within new developments that the same type of “strip” development that we are working to redevelop in the older corridors shall be discouraged from being initiated within new commercial developments.

4. Amend the second and third sentences of the **Mixed Use Corporate Park** definition to read as follows: “Primary uses such as office, flex office, technology research and development, light manufacturing, distribution, and assembly are strongly encouraged to be developed prior to or in conjunction with any supportive uses. The primary uses should be ~~placed~~ developed in a campus-like or “corporate park” setting ...”

Ms. Galanti stated that the primary intent of this land use classification is to encourage corporate park developments in a campus-like setting with supporting uses such as retail, hotels and residential (e.g. Piedmont Center). Since the adoption of the Plan, there has been a desire for the developers to develop the supporting uses for corporate users that will follow later. Therefore, a modification of the definition was deemed necessary to state that the corporate uses “...are strongly encouraged to be developed prior to or in conjunction with any supportive uses.” This will help prevent the designated Corporate Park areas from being consumed by supporting uses and not leaving enough room for the corporate user.

Clarification Statement to Figure 4-2

Amend the Generalized Future Land Use Map (Figure 4-2) to add a clarification statement to read as follows: “This map is to be interpreted in conjunction with the goals and policies set forth in the Greensboro Connections 2025 Comprehensive Plan. This map has no independent significance without reference to the Greensboro Connections 2025 Comprehensive Plan.”

Ms. Galanti stated that this statement emphasizes that the map and the written text of the Plan are to be used in conjunction with one another and that the map should not be used in isolation to make land use interpretations.

Ms. Galanti said the staff report contained the complete definitions of the different land use classifications and supportive uses.

Ms. Galanti said staff supports these text changes due to factors such as:

- Keeping the Plan relevant and current;
- implementing the Plan through the recognition and promotion of corridor and neighborhood plans;
- clearing up confusion (e.g., gap between Low and Moderate Residential densities);
- further supporting the goals of mixed use and the reduction of auto trips (e.g. allowing offices in the multi-family land use classifications); and
- clarifying intent (e.g., types and timing of development, tying the map to the text of the Plan).

The Planning Department recommends approval of the amendments contained in this report.

No one was present who wished to speak to these proposed amendments and Chair Downs closed the public hearing.

Mr. Pike moved the recommendation of the Text Amendments. Mr. Rhodes seconded the motion. The Board voted 8-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Downs, Hall, Pike, Rhodes, Bryson, Marks, Koonce, Fox. Nays: None.)

G. ORDINANCE AMENDING THE COMMUNITY STRUCTURE MAP (FIGURE 5-2) OF THE GREENSBORO CONNECTIONS 2025 COMPREHENSIVE PLAN AS FOLLOWS:
1) ADD PISGAH CHURCH/LEES CHAPEL ROAD FROM BATTLEGROUND AVENUE TO RUDD STATION ROAD AS A PROPOSED SCENIC CORRIDOR, AND 2) AMEND THE LEGEND TO REMOVE THE WORD “VISUAL” FROM “PROPOSED SCENIC/VISUAL CORRIDOR.” (RECOMMENDED)

Ms. Galanti presented slides that contained the proposed amendment to the Community Structure Map separately and explained them fully. She said staff supports these changes due to factors such as:

- It was an oversight not to include Pisgah Church/Lees Chapel Road on the Community Structure Map as a Proposed Scenic Corridor;
- In 1996, a corridor study was conducted for Pisgah Church Road/Lees Chapel Road and it recommended that the entire corridor be designated as a scenic corridor overlay district ; and
- It corrects a clerical error so that the corridor names in the legend match the terms that are defined in the text of the Plan.

The Planning Department recommends approval of these amendments.

Ms. Galanti said this amendment places Pisgah Church/Lees Chapel Road on the Community Structure Map for further study and consideration for a designation of Scenic Corridor overlay.

No one was present who wished to speak to these proposed amendments and Chair Downs closed

the public hearing.

Mr. Fox moved to recommend an ordinance amending the Community Structure Map. Mr. Rhodes seconded the motion. The Board voted 8-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Downs, Hall, Pike, Rhodes, Marks, Koonce, Bryson, Fox. Nays: None.)

ANNEXATION PETITIONS:

A. PROPERTIES OF MAGGIE B. WADFORD; RUTH P. JESSUP AND MARGARET P. JESSUP; MARLENE N. COCKERHAM; ANN PULLIUM; WALTER G. BARHAM; BATTLEGROUND MCCOY, LLC; AND CHARTER DEVELOPMENT CO., LLC ON THE EAST SIDE OF BATTLEGROUND AVENUE (US HIGHWAY 220 NORTH) FROM 4022 THROUGH 4058 – 40.54-ACRE CONTIGUOUS ANNEXATION. (RECOMMENDED)

Mr. MacIntosh said the property covered by this regular annexation petition abuts the primary city limits on its south and east sides. The property is occupied by a few houses. This property, together with the already-annexed property immediately to the southeast, is proposed for rezoning and original zoning to permit a planned unit development, which would feature an apartment complex on the to-be-annexed portion of the property. If Council approves this zoning, a Unified Development Plan will come before this Board for review, accompanied by an already-submitted street closing petition for the short dead end section of Old Battleground Road. There is a 12-inch City water line alongside the property in Battleground Avenue (US Hwy 220 North). The property drains northward toward the Rayle Creek sewer outfall, which runs across the northern part of this property. Provision of other City services would be similar to their provision to the already-annexed properties west and east of this property. The property is within the Tier 1 Growth Area as identified in the Comprehensive Plan. The TRC recommends the annexation.

In response to a Board member's question, Mr. MacIntosh added that this entire property is in Watershed Critical Area Tiers 3 and 4.

Mr. Rhodes moved to recommend this annexation to City Council. Mr. Marks seconded the motion. The Board voted 8-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Downs, Hall, Pike, Rhodes, Bryson, Koonce, Marks, Fox. Nays: None.)

B. PROPERTY OF JOHN D. LOVE OIL COMPANY, INC. AT 4311 HICONE ROAD – 1.3-ACRE SATELLITE ANNEXATION. (RECOMMENDED)

Mr. MacIntosh said the property covered by this utility agreement and annexation petition lies across Hicone Road from the property of Fellowship Hall, a satellite annexation recommended by the Board last month. The property is within the Tier 1 Growth Area. It contains a Chevron gas station/convenience store. There is a 12-inch City water line in Hicone Road. There is no City sewer line nearby. This annexation would not obligate the City to extend a sewer line. The provision of other City services should be comparable to their provision to previous satellite annexations farther out in the same direction. The TRC recommends the annexation.

Mr. Pike moved to recommend this annexation to City Council. Mr. Bryson seconded the motion. The Board voted 8-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Downs, Hall, Pike, Rhodes, Bryson, Koonce, Marks,

Fox. Nays: None.)

ITEMS FROM THE DEPARTMENT:

A. COUNCIL DISCUSSION ON POSSIBLE MERGER OF THE PLANNING BOARD AND ZONING COMMISSION.

Mr. Hails said there was a discussion at a recent City Council meeting about considering possible merger of the Planning Board and the Zoning Commission. City Council has set further discussion on this matter for their work session scheduled for February 22, 2005. They also asked staff to undertake a survey of other major cities in North Carolina to see what sort of setup they have with their Planning and Zoning groups, and staff has that underway. They also asked staff to solicit comments from both this Board and the Zoning Commission and relay them on to Council prior to that date. As the 22nd is after this Board's next meeting, staff could receive any comments you have now, in between now and your next meeting, or at your next meeting and relay them on to Council by the 22nd.

Chair Downs asked if staff could send the Planning Board members an e-mail soliciting those comments. He would like to think and consider this item because he sees this from a number of perspectives.

Mr. Fox said he would also request that along with the e-mail, if it were possible, to include the minutes section of the City Council meeting in which that discussion occurred. It would probably be helpful for them to see that context.

Mr. Hails said he believed their discussion took place at a work session and he was not sure what kind of minutes they have of that. He thought some of the same sentiment that led to this Board and the Zoning Commission sitting together to hear the amendment and a zoning case at the same point in time is probably reflective of this.

He said that the survey was going to lay a lot of different issues out on the table. If staff has that survey completed prior to the next Board meeting, they will send it out to the Planning Board and the Zoning Commission so that comments can be made at the next meeting.

Mr. Hails was asked if City Council asked staff to make a recommendation with respect to that, and if so, had staff reached a conclusion?

Mr. Hails said staff basically said they were following the Council directive on establishing the joint hearing setup and that there had been a lot of effort on all parties to pull that together and they had set up a schedule for 2005 for those joint meetings. Staff's recommendation was that Council at least wait six months and get through three or four of these hearings and then do a little more evaluation on how they were working. That was staff's preliminary recommendation. If they do want to make some substantive structural changes in the setup, staff may make further recommendation on that.

Mr. Fox left the meeting at 4:50 p.m.

Mr. Marks said in the survey that staff would send out, it would be interesting to see if this joint board

that may operate in some of these cities, do they meet once a month or do they meet two weeks because generally the Planning Board meetings are substantially shorter than Zoning

Commission. If we throw this together, it would be quite a burden for those members who sit on a single board to hear the whole circumstance.

Mr. Bryson left the meeting at 4:53 p.m.

B. THERE WILL BE A PRESENTATION BY THE FIRE DEPARTMENT AT THE FEBRUARY MEETING.

Mr. Hails said that pursuant to the Board's discussion of annexation a month ago with regards to a comment they received from the Fire Department, they have agreed to come to the next meeting and make a presentation about how they review different annexation proposals relative to providing fire service. He said he did not know of any department in the City that does as much advance planning as they do. They have maps showing every possible future fire station location. They are certified internationally as one of the outstanding departments that exist and part of that high quality work is their advance planning.

ITEMS FROM BOARD MEMBERS:

Mr. Marks thanked staff for information that they handed out, which he thought was good in helping the Board members to clarify Planning Board responsibilities. He did find a little of a conflict going on in some of the wording.

Mr. Koonce said he would like to say "thank you" to the staff for its homework because he knew they got a lot of information coming from every side. He said he would like to know what is the impetus causing the staff to look closer at the Comp Plan. Is it more of a citizen request based on what you want to do with a particular land and how it can be used in the future? Staff really needs to consider the inclusiveness of the Comp Plan as staff decides on how the land is going to be used and hopefully not be persuaded by a particular citizen request for whatever benefit. Mr. Koonce said they wanted to know how staff is thinking as well, as they represent the citizens of Greensboro.

APPROVAL OF ABSENCES:

Mr. Rhodes moved the approval of the absence of J.P. McIntyre, seconded by Mr. Marks. The Board voted 8-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Downs, Hall, Pike, Rhodes, Marks, Koonce, Bryson, Fox. Nays: None.

* * * * *

There being no further business before the Board, the meeting was adjourned at 5:01 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Richard W. Hails, AICP
Planning Director

